

preferences. And they haven't just implied this. More than one Democrat has actually straight-out called this Supreme Court illegitimate, despite the fact that every single Justice on the Supreme Court was duly nominated and confirmed in accordance with the Constitution of the United States.

And the Senate, despite having the slimmest possible majority, in fact—a merely technical majority and absolutely no mandate for radical change—Democrats have pushed to abolish the legislative filibuster so they can steamroll through far-left Democratic legislation, including a partisan takeover of election law and, of course, the most extreme abortion legislation ever considered in Congress.

Just imagine the howls that would have resulted if Republicans had announced that we were going to abolish the legislative filibuster to institute a 20-week abortion ban—a ban that is much more in line with the sentiments of the majority of Americans than Democrats' far-left abortion legislation.

Or take the protests that have been going on at the Supreme Court Justices' homes. The President and other Democrats have made it clear they are perfectly fine with demonstrators congregating at the private homes of Supreme Court Justices to try and intimidate them into changing their vote.

I have to ask, would Democrats be fine with pro-life activists appearing at the homes of Justice Breyer, Justice Kagan, and Justice Sotomayor to try to intimidate them into changing their votes? I think we all know the answer to that. But because abortion is one of Democrats' pet issues, clearly, the usual rules don't apply. "Government knows best" quickly becomes "Democrats know best," which leads to one rule for Democrats and one rule for everyone else.

"Government knows best" is not a vision Republicans share. We believe that individuals, not Washington bureaucrats, are the best judges of what they and their family and children need. The government should be a backstop, not Big Brother.

We also know the more government expands, the more individual liberty shrinks, which is why we are firmly committed to a philosophy of limited government. Our country is founded to safeguard individual liberty and preserving that liberty it a sacred trust, which is why Republicans will continue to oppose Democrats' "Washington knows best," Big Government philosophy, and why we will continue to fight to make sure that Americans' right to run their own lives and shape their own destinies is protected.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

NOMINATION OF MARY T. BOYLE

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, in a few moments, the Senate will vote on the confirmation of Mary Boyle to be a

Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, CPSC. It appears that the Democratic leader, Senator SCHUMER, finally has the votes lined up for confirmation of Ms. Boyle and that she will be elevated to this position. I think this is a decision that Members of the Democratic Party and the administration will come to regret and Americans, in general, will come to regret.

Recently, the Commerce Committee failed to report Ms. Boyle's nomination favorably. All Democrats voted aye; all Republicans voted no.

I think Members should understand this. CPSC plays a vital role in ensuring the safety of American consumers. For this reason, I have significant concerns about major administrative failures at the agency during Ms. Boyle's tenure as Executive Director there, including the improper disclosure of unredacted manufacturer and consumer data.

An investigation I led as chairman of the Commerce Committee last Congress determined that the unauthorized release of this data, which violated section 6(b) of the Consumer Product Safety Act, was the result of insufficient training, ineffective management, and poor information technology implementation.

All of these failings at the CPSC were under Mary Boyle's watch as the primary career official charged with the day-to-day administration of the Agency's business, and yet today we are being asked to elevate her to an even more important and responsible position at CPSC.

I am also deeply troubled by the CPSC's curtailing of port inspections for several months beginning with the pandemic and Ms. Boyle's involvement in this decision. In addition, she presided over the deficient and prolonged process of fully returning CPSC staff to work at these ports. So the inspections were not getting done. There are now hundreds, if not thousands, of unsafe products that entered the country under Ms. Boyle's watch, and we still lack a clear plan from the CPSC on how those dangerous products will be removed from the market.

This nominee has failed to demonstrate strong and effective leadership in her current position as executive director of the CPSC. Yet the administration and, apparently, the majority leader of the Senate are inexplicably trying to promote her to a higher position of trust and authority.

In light of these many problems at the Agency associated with Ms. Boyle's leadership, I think her confirmation will be a mistake, and I think my Democratic colleagues and the administration will come to regret this decision.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BOOKER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ARTISTS

Mr. BOOKER. I rise not expecting to give a speech today, but I want to, first and foremost, recognize the Chair, who is my "mother" Senator, and I want to thank her for her incredible service to this institution.

I want to thank, which I rarely do, the staff who works here and runs the Senate every day, but I rise today to talk for a moment about groups that we don't talk about enough on this floor. We usually talk about everybody from law enforcement to our military, but we don't talk about artists.

We are a nation that even from our founding during Revolutionary times, there were extraordinary artists who expanded the moral imagination of this country and helped us to see a nation that could be free from British rule and domination.

In every point of American history, from protest movements to battles for suffrage, we have had artists who have painted these pictures of an America, a vision for what could be, but even more than that, they have healed us during difficult times. They have pulled us together with their inspiration. They have called out injustices. They have brought light to the dark places of our country.

You know, Picasso talked about art being something that helps to shake the dust off the soul of humanity, but I think it does more than that. As an African American, I have seen art in the tradition of healing, of providing hope, of even calling out with specificity the instructions on how to be free.

We remember the song that Harriet Tubman pointed to:

Wade in the water, wade in the water, God is going to trouble the water.

That is the tradition that sourced my family. From enduring the pain of a nation that was unequal and divided, often in church with gospel songs, there was healing; there was hope. And even the poetry in the Harlem Renaissance spoke to an America that could possibly be if we just never stop believing.

As the great poet Langston Hughes said:

America never was America to me,

[But] I swear this oath—

America will be!

Who made America,

Whose sweat and blood, whose faith and pain,

Whose hand at the foundry, whose plow in the rain,

Must [make] our . . . dream [live] again.

O, yes, I say it plain,

America never was America to me,

And yet I swear this oath—

America will be!

I lean on poetry and song today just to get myself up in the morning. I have seen how artists have come to visit us here in the Capitol and Senators from